



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,162	12/29/2000	Keuk-Sang Kwon	3430-0164P	6546
2292	7590	02/04/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			LANEAU, RONALD	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2674		
DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004				

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/750,162	KWON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ronald Laneau	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 1/2/04 has been entered. New claims 9-15 are added and claims 1-15 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Oh et al (5,856,818).

Oh et al (US 5,856,818) was cited in previous action.

As per claim 1, Applicant disclose in the AAPA a quad type liquid crystal display device RGGB comprising a liquid crystal panel having gate and data lines which define sub-pixel

regions, gate driving integrated circuits seen either on the left and the right side of the circuit, a plurality of data drive circuits 115c, 115d arranged on one side of the liquid crystal panel and in this case on the upper portion of the panel, each of the data drive integrated circuits having "m" (m is natural number) number of channels as claimed (see AAPA, figure 5). Oh et al is cited to show that using more than three data drive ICs (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, ...) in a single bank structure for a liquid crystal display device is well known in the art as seen in figure 11. Neither the AAPA nor Oh et al discloses the (3n-1) channels for each data drive but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to spread out the floating channels or the non-use channels over the entire drive IC because it would provide a good balance in preventing the waste of liquid crystal inserted between the substrates.

As per claim 2, Applicant discloses in the AAPA a device wherein each of two sub-pixels correspond to red, a first green, a second green, and a blue color filters as claimed (see figure 5).

As per claim 3, the device disclosed in the AAPA is a device wherein m is 384 as claimed (see page 5, lines 1-2 of AAPA, figure 5).

As per claims 4 and 8, Applicant discloses in the AAPA only three data integrated circuits (see figure 5) but Oh et al is cited to teach a liquid crystal display having driving integrated circuits in a single bank and including first to nth D-ICs spatially arranged in the upper region of the liquid crystal panel (fig. 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize four data drive integrated circuits (D-ICs) as taught by Oh et al into the AAPA for the same reasons stated in claim 1.

As per claims 5 and 6, Applicant discloses in the AAPA a liquid crystal display panel having a plurality of drive integrated circuits for driving the panel, each having "m" (natural number) number of channels and "n" ($n < m$, natural number) number of floating channels see figure 5), a plurality of film for connecting the drive integrated circuits. Applicant does not disclose in the AAPA that each film having $(m-n)$ number of lines. Oh et al is cited to show that using more than three data drive ICs (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, ...) in a single bank structure for a liquid crystal display device is well known in the art as seen in figure 11. Neither the AAPA nor Oh et al discloses the $(m-n)$ channels for each data drive but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to spread out the floating channels or the non-use channels over the entire drive IC because it would provide a good balance in preventing the waste of liquid crystal inserted between the substrates.

As per claim 7, the device disclosed in the AAPA is a device wherein m is 384 as claimed (see page 5, lines 1-2 of AAPA, figure 5).

As per claim 9, Applicant discloses in the AAPA a device wherein each of two sub-pixels correspond to red, a first green, a second green, and a blue color filters as claimed (see figure 5).

As per claim 11, Applicant discloses in the AAPA only three data integrated circuits (see figure 5) but Oh et al is cited to teach a liquid crystal display having driving integrated circuits in a single bank and including first to nth D-ICs spatially arranged in the upper region of the liquid crystal panel (fig. 11).

As per claims 10, 14 and 15, the AAPA discloses an IC wherein there are at least three data drive integrated circuits which also would include four as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12 and 13 are objected to

As per claims 12 and 13, a device wherein a first group of four sub-pixels for a first pixel have one of positive and negative polarity, and a next group of four sub-pixels for a next pixel have the other of positive and negative polarity, and remaining groups of four sub-pixels for remaining pixels alternate between positive and negative polarity.

Response to arguments

Applicant argues that the rational is insufficient to modify the AAPA to arrive at the claimed invention. Contrary to applicant's arguments, one skilled in the art would be very motivated in combining the Oh et al reference with the AAPA to reasonably arrive at the claimed invention. Furthermore, applicant argues that he examiner has not provided any suggestion in the art to "spread out" the channels as stated. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *in re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *in re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (fed. Cir. 1992).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is 703-305-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6.00 PM or via email:
ronald.laneau@uspto.gov.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached at 703-305-4709.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.

Ronald Laneau
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

rl
January 28, 2004



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600